EXHIBIT 2

GYASI TRANSCRIPT

66T8GYAC1

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2 ----
2
3
  KWABENA GYASI,
3
4
                  Plaintiff,
4
5
                v.
                                          05 Cv. 9453 (SAS)
 5
6 THE CITY OF NEW YORK, et al.,
6
7
                  Defendants.
 7
8 -----x
8
9
                                           June 29, 2006
                                            9
                                           4:40 p.m.
10
10
    Before:
11
                        HON. SHIRA A. SCHEINDLIN
11
12
12
                                           District Judge
13
13
                             APPEARANCES
14
14
     JOEL BERGER
15
          Attorney for Plaintiff
15
    MICHAEL A. CARDOZO
16
16
          Corporation Counsel of the City of New York
17
    SHERYL BRUZZESE
17
         Assistant Corporation Counsel
18
18
19
19
20
20
21
21
22
22
23
                            24
                            24
```

66T8GYAC6

left holding the bag. Which is why we frequently get punitives for a thousand, two thousand, whatever.

The reality is, and those of us who have tracked this for years know it, if the city has represented the officer, if it's a case in which the city has determined the officer is entitled to representation, it's not an off-duty incident, the city invariably does indemnify.

THE COURT: Do you dispute that, Ms. Bruzzese, that at the end of the day, if this was done in the line of duty during work hours as part of his regular job, when push comes to shove, you will indemnify him if there is punitive damages? Do you dispute that?

MS. BRUZZESE: Not necessarily.

THE COURT: Not necessarily what? Was the answer yes? MS. BRUZZESE: We do dispute that. Under 50(k), if punitive damages are awarded, there is a finding by the jury that basically the officer violated the rules and regulations, and under that --

THE COURT: I understand. But Mr. Berger claims the reality is, despite that, you always indemnify the officer for punitive damages, and that's why he wants the discovery, because I agree with him, I am not going to mislead the jury.

If in fact discovery were to show that 99 out of 100 times when there has been a punitive damage award, in reality, the city has always indemnified, then that's the reality.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 005 0200

(212) 805-0300

66T8GYAC7

That's the reality, and I am not charging something that's not true.

MS. BRUZZESE: The problem is that I don't understand what claim this goes to. The discovery needs to likely lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

THE COURT: Yes. I will not mischarge the jury.

MS. BRUZZESE: We haven't even gotten to that point.

THE COURT: I am not talking about when. Put aside when. Not today or a month or two months. I am thinking of ever. Unless you're prepared to concede that if a punitive damage award is made by the jury, the city will pay, at some point this discovery is necessary so as not to mislead the jury.

I am not talking about today. I am not going to rule today, but I want you to understand the issue. If this case goes to trial, if there is a liability finding, if the jury then gets punitive damages as an issue, I am not going to mislead them, thinking that it comes out of the poor officer's pocket and have the poor officer say, I have a wife and three kids and a mortgage, I can barely afford the payments, and I earn only 38,000, whatever. I am not going to have all of that. If in fact the reality is that in the last 100 punitive damages awards the city has always indemnified, I am not going to have that testimony at all about his wife, kids and poor salary, because it's all irrelevant.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300